DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 950 EC 042 667

AUTHOR Johnston, William
TITLE A Study to Determine Teacher Attitude Toward Teaching Special Children with Regular Children.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 12p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Regular Class Placement; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The investigation to determine teacher attitudes toward regular class placement for handicapped children included an opinionnaire, eight personal contacts with teachers, and four observations. Results indicated that every teacher answering the opinionnaire agreed that class progress was not impeded by presence of the handicapped student. The overall finding was that teachers did not find having a special student in the class a problem. Many teachers expressed amazement at the achievement of the handicapped children. Availability of resource teachers was found to be helpful to regular teachers. (CB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 065950

A STUDY TO DETERMINE TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHING SPECIAL CHILDREN WITH REGULAR CHILDREN

A Research

Presented to

ERIC

By

William Johnston

Teacher

Special Education District of McHenry County

Graduate Student

Northern Illinois University

EC 042 667E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Statement of Problem 1
[illegible] 1
[illegible] 1
[illegible] 5
[illegible] 8
[illegible] 9
[illegible] 10
[illegible] 11

Statement of the Problem

In the past few years there seems to be an ever increasing number of students placed in special education classes because of student-to-teacher-related conflicts rather than because of any type of mental or physical handicap. In order to enable these students to stay in school rather than drop out, more and more special education children are started placing these students into selected classes with the so-called regular program of the school. The success or failure of these students depends very much on the attitudes of the teachers in the classes they are placed. This study tried to bring out some of the attitudes of the regular classroom teachers that become involved with having special education students and also to find if these students were making any progress socially since being placed in classes with regular students. The investigation included an opinionaire, eight interviews with the teachers, and four observations.

Definition of Terms and Subjects

The term special education and special student in this study will refer to students that fall in the low normal range of intelligence as measured by a standard intelligence instrument. It will also refer to students that have been classified as emotionally disturbed and some that have been labeled learning disability. The latter two categories were established because of large variance in intelligence when measured on a standard intelligence test. The intelligence test used was the WISC. The subjects were all between the ages of twelve and fifteen.

Limits and Procedures

[illegible] regular classroom to show, hence the special teacher tended to [illegible] while [illegible] than the regular classroom teacher did.

[illegible] this last statement we can look at a report by Horn [illegible]. They found that the slow children in the regular [illegible] because of the teacher's attitude and [illegible] attitudes toward the slower pupil.

[illegible], there were four schools involved. All of the schools [illegible] self-contained special education classrooms and also all but one have a resource type special education classroom. In the resource [illegible] special students are allowed to attend selected classes with the regular flow of students. They return to the special teacher for remedial help and for any extra help they need with their regular work. In the resource the special student spends two hours a day with the resource teacher and the rest of the day with the mainstream of students. The students were involved in all areas of the curriculum. There were two pupils that were fully integrated and, with the exception of one study period, did not attend any special classes at all. These two were classified as emotionally disturbed and had been known, in the past, to have violent emotional outbursts; however, for the present they were functioning at a very normal level.

In an effort to get an idea as to how the regular classroom teacher reacted to having a special student in his/her classroom the investigator [illegible] an opinionaire using the Likert Scale. The opinionaire was [illegible] for and against having a special child in their room. There was a 92% return of the opinionaires.

[illegible] 52% of the teachers responding agreed that the special child did not [illegible] with the other children in their classroom; only 22% disagreed. It is interesting to note that the teachers that claimed to agree and disagreed with this question were the teachers of the [illegible] and the high mentally handicapped youngsters. It appears that the teachers with the emotionally disturbed or the borderline retarded might be more in [illegible] agreement.

Although academic ability was not a primary factor in having these children placed, most of the teachers found that the special students were making progress academically and felt they were doing better in a self contained class, while if they were kept in a self contained class for the entire day. This tends to strengthen Finkle [13] feeling that a special ed teacher can do as much or more progress in a regular class as those that are placed in a special classroom.

Every teacher that answered the questionaire agreed that they were not impeding the rest of the class by giving special treatment to the special student. With the students that the investigator became involved with this was quite true. These students were required to do the same amount of work in the same amount of time as the other students in the class. However, perhaps some of the academic success of these students came from the fact that the special teacher to which they were assigned would help them when they returned to the special classroom.

Concerning if they socialized more individualized materials to aid their pupils and their [illegible], the teachers became divided; 39% agreed, 39% disagreed and the rest didn't know. This seems to indicate that

level of the class. If they were not willing to work to the standards set for them they would be sent back to the special classroom. In some cases involving emotionally disturbed and learning disability youngsters the reward of being in a regular classroom was enough for them to strive to get along academically and socially.

Overall, the teachers were receptive to special students once they understood what a special youngster was. The teachers were much more willing to work with a special student if there was a resource teacher involved with the resource teacher setting up the goals and objectives for the child. When the suggestion of placing a special child into their classroom without the benefit of a resource teacher the teachers were not willing. They still believe labels and they still wait for the special child to do something atypical.

1. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1973, [illegible].

2. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1972, [illegible].

3. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1972, [illegible].

4. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1972, [illegible].

5. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1972, [illegible].

6. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1971, [illegible].

7. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1973, [illegible].

8. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], 1971, [illegible].

9. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

10. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

11. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

12. [illegible], "[illegible]," _____, [illegible], [illegible], [illegible].

APPENDICES

OPI[illegible]ITUDE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

In working with exceptional children there is a continuing question as to whether we should segregate these students in individual classes or integrate them into the regular classroom. This opinionnaire is to determine your attitudes and opinion in regard to some areas relating to this problem.

The measure of the following will be designated as:
Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral (N), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD)

1. The exceptional child gets along socially with other children in the classroom situations that occur in your room.
SA A N D SD

2. The behavior of the exceptional child in your classroom has improved since he was first entered this integrated situation.
SA A N D SD

3. The exceptional child is gaining some academic learning in your class.
SA A N D SD

4. The exceptional child would learn more academically if he were in a segregated, special classroom all of the time.
SA A N D SD

5. The regular students in your classroom would be ahead of where they are now socially if the exceptional child was not in the classroom.
SA A N D SD

6. You hold back the progress of some in your classroom academically so the exceptional child can feel some success.
SA A N D SD

7. You need a teacher's aid to help you in doing a better job academically and socially with the exceptional child in your room.
SA A N D SD

8. You could have more success with both the fast and the slow student if you had more individualized material to work with.
SA A N D SD

9. You know where to get more individualized materials with which to work with the fast or slow children in your room.
SA A N D SD

10. You have had success with the exceptional child in your classroom.
SA A N D SD

1.	2	2	1	4		55.5%	22.4%
2.	4	2	1	1		72.2%	5.5%
3.	6	12	3		1	77.7%	5.5%
4.	2		2	10	4	11.1%	77.7%
5.				14	4		100%
6.		2	3	6	7	11.1%	72.2%
7.		3	4	7	2	17.7%	50%
8.	2	5	2	6	1	22.2%	38.8%
9.	1	4	3	6	4	27.7%	55.5%
10.	4	11	3			83.3%	